



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/576,598	04/21/2006	Giorgio Bertolini	2003IT304	4108
38263 7590 10/04/2007 PROPAT, L.L.C. 425-C SOUTH SHARON AMITY ROAD CHARLOTTE, NC 28211-2841			EXAMINER BALASUBRAMANIAN, VENKATARAMAN	
			ART UNIT 1624	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/04/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

The preliminary amendment, which included addition of new claims 9-11 and amendment to claims 1-8, filed on 4/21/2006, is made of record. Claims 1-11 are now pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

Reference cited in the Information Disclosure Statement, filed on 4/21/2006, is made of record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 2, 6 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

1. Recitation of "approx." in claim 2 renders this claim indefinite, as it is not clear what is intended. In addition, claim 2 recites a temperature range and hence how to approx. the range is unclear.
2. Regarding claim 6, the phrase "preferably" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).
3. Claim 10 is indefinite as it recites "tetrachloride" as a Lewis acid. It is not clear what is intended.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 1624

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for compound of formula I and II using tin tetrachloride as Lewis acid, does not reasonably provide enablement for compound of formula I & II wherein the Lewis acid is other than tin tetrachloride. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The following apply:

In evaluating the enablement question, following factors are considered. Note *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 and *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546. The factors include: 1) The nature of the invention, 2) the state of the prior art, 3) the predictability or lack thereof in the art, 4) the amount of direction or guidance present, 5) the presence or absence of working examples, 6) the breadth of the claims, and 7) the quantity of experimentation needed.

1. The nature of the invention and the state of the prior art:

The invention is drawn to a process of coupling compound of formula III with compound of formula IV to get compound of formula I or II using Lewis acid as catalyst. Specification is not adequately enabled as to how to make compounds of formula (I) or (II) in said purity and yield as shown in table 1 and Table II of the specification when using Lewis acid other than tin tetrachloride. As shown in the specification even with the use of tin tetrachloride varying temperature about 10° C

results in varying yield and impurity. Therefore, it stands to reason that use any Lewis acid would not result in the same yield and purity. Furthermore, the comparative data provided for in the specification is to overcome any potential obviousness rejection. Hence, representative examples using other Lewis acid is needed to accept the generality of the instant process as embraced in the claim language. Specification offers no teachings or suggestion as to how to perform the process in presence of other Lewis acid catalyst.

2. The predictability or lack thereof in the art:

Hence the process as applied to the above-mentioned compounds claimed by the applicant is not an art-recognized process and hence there should be adequate enabling disclosure in the specification with working example(s).

3. The amount of direction or guidance present:

Examples illustrated in the experimental section or written description offer no guidance or teachings as to how perform the process of making compound of formula I and II using tin tetrachloride only, not with other catalyst.

4. The presence or absence of working examples:

Although examples 1-2 show the coupling process, they are limited to tin tetrachloride as Lewis acid catalyst, which is taught in US 4,330,729. There are no representative examples showing the viability of the process for plurality of Lewis acids embraced in the instant claims.

5. The breadth of the claims:

Art Unit: 1624

Specification has no support, as noted above, for all Lewis acids generically embraced in the claim language would lead to desired compound of formula I or II and there is also no valid chemical reasoning for one trained in the art to expect that as evident from the relative difference seen with minor change in temperature.

7. The quantity of experimentation needed:

The quantity of experimentation needed would be an undue burden on skilled art in the chemical art since there is inadequate guidance given to the skilled artisan for the many reasons stated above. Even with the undue burden of experimentation, there is no guarantee that one would get the product of desired structure, namely compound of formula I and II embraced in the instant claims, in view of the prior art teachings.

Thus, factors such as "sufficient working examples", the "level of skill in the art and predictability, etc. have been demonstrated to be sufficiently lacking in the case for the instant claims.

Note In re Surrey 151 USPQ 724 regarding sufficiency of disclosure for Markush group. Also see MPEP 2164.03 for enablement requirements in cases directed to structure-sensitive art such as the pharmaceuticals.

Note Ex parte Gelles 22 USPQ 2nd 1318, especially the following quote: " The evidence relied upon also should be reasonably commensurate in scope with the subject matter claimed and illustrate the claimed subject matter " as a class" relative to prior art subject matter."

Art Unit: 1624

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be addressed to Venkataraman Balasubramanian (Bala) whose telephone number is (571) 272-0662. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8.00 AM to 6.00 PM. The Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) of the art unit 1624 is James O. Wilson, whose telephone number is 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned (571) 273-8300. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAG. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-2 17-9197 (toll-free).


Venkataraman Balasubramanian

10/1/2007